REMARKS

This response addresses the issues raised by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed November 29, 2005. Initially, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given in this case. Claims 1 and 3-7 have been currently amended. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 3-7 are pending in this case all to more clearly and distinctly claim Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments as they place the application in condition for allowance or in better condition for possible appeal.

Applicant has amended independent Claim 1 to claim a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft which are intended to be push-fitted simultaneously one into the other to fix the inertial unit to the rack, the inertial unit comprising inertial sensors which, in real time, measure acceleration and rotation data which are then compiled in a mathematical model in order to deduce therefrom the position of the aircraft in space, the peg comprising an anterior portion to be introduced with clearance into the sleeve and a posterior fixing part, wherein the posterior part of the peg is designed to compensate for the clearance, the diameter of the posterior fixing part of the peg being greater than the diameter of the sleeve, and the peg being slotted. Support for inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft may be found throughout the specification, for example, at page 1, line 19 and page 2, lines 24-29, respectively. Also, support for the inertial unit comprising inertial sensors which, in real time, measure acceleration and rotation data which are then compiled in a mathematical model in order to deduce therefrom the position of the aircraft in space may be found throughout the specification, for example, at page 3, lines 12-17.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendment presented does in fact more specifically define the invention, and place the application in condition for allowance. Entry of the amendment , and reconsideration of the application as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,630,983 to Fischer ("Fischer"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,850,676 to Takahashi et al. ("Takahashi"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

The Examiner has conceded that Fischer discloses only one assembly of a peg and sleeve, not a plurality as claimed. The Examiner then refers to Takahashi to cure this deficiency. Accordingly, the Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify Fischer, such that a plurality of pegs and sleeves, as taught by Takahashi are used to fasten to the rack to the inertial unit. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In order to establish obviousness of a claimed invention, all elements of the claims must be disclosed, taught or suggested by the prior art. None of the references teach a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft which are intended to be push-fitted simultaneously one into the other to fix the inertial unit to the rack where the inertial unit comprising inertial sensors which, in real time, measure acceleration and rotation data which are then compiled in a mathematical model in order to deduce therefrom the position of the aircraft in space.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Fischer does not disclose plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit and a rack. Fischer discloses an expansion pin that is capable of further expansion should the drill hole become wider. See Col. 1, lines 29-32. The expansion pin in Fischer has a shank which can be expanded by means of an expansion element that engages in an aperture region. See Col. 1, lines 5-10. However, Fischer does not disclose a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft which are intended to be push-fitted simultaneously one into the other to fix the inertial unit to the rack where the inertial unit comprising inertial sensors which, in real time, measure acceleration and rotation data which are then compiled in a mathematical model in order to deduce therefrom the position of the aircraft in space. Further, the field of invention in Fischer is completely different from the present invention. Fischer discloses clamping an article to a piece of masonry whereas Applicant's invention discloses fixing an inertial unit of an aircraft to a rack of an aircraft.

In regards to Takahashi, Takahashi discloses a clip with engaging mechanism. See Col. 1, lines 9-19. The clip in Takahashi comprises a male member and a female member , the latter comprising elastic pieces, to connect two or more panels, the clips being arranged so that the elastic pieces are prevented from being deviated when deviating force is applied. Takahashi does not disclose a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft which are intended to be push-fitted

simultaneously one into the other to fix the inertial unit to the rack where the inertial unit comprising inertial sensors which, in real time, measure acceleration and rotation data which are then compiled in a mathematical model in order to deduce therefrom the position of the aircraft in space. In contrast, in the present invention, the pegs are part of one of the inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft, and the sleeves are part of the other one. This is unlike Takahashi, where both members are independent from the two pieces to be fixed.

Applicant respectfully submit that the claimed plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft is not obvious over the teaching of Fischer in view of Takahashi. In addition, one skilled in the art would find nothing in Fischer or Takahashi alone or in combination that would disclose, teach or suggest the claimed composition or any reason for making it. This is because there is no motivation taught in any of the references to combine the references in such a way to provide the plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,630,983 to Fischer ("Fischer"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,850,676 to Takahashi et al. ("Takahashi") as applied to claim 6 above, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,962,775 to King, Jr.("King"). This rejection is respectfully traversed and believed overcome in view of the following discussion.

The Examiner has conceded that Fischer and Takahashi do not disclose the peg to be coated with a graphite deposit. The Examiner then refers to King to cure this deficiency. Accordingly, the Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify Fischer and Takahashi, such that a graphite deposit is included on the peg of Fischer, to lubricate the peg, thereby allowing easier insertion into the sleeve. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In order to establish obviousness of a claimed invention, all elements of the claims must be disclosed, taught or suggested by the prior art. None of the references teach a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft which are intended to be push-fitted simultaneously one into the other to fix the inertial unit to the rack where the inertial unit comprising inertial sensors which, in real time,

measure acceleration and rotation data which are then compiled in a mathematical model in order to deduce therefrom the position of the aircraft in space.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Fischer and Takahashi do not disclose the peg to be coated with a graphite deposit. As stated above, both Fischer and Takahashi do not disclose a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft which are intended to be push-fitted simultaneously one into the other to fix the inertial unit to the rack where the inertial unit comprising inertial sensors which, in real time, measure acceleration and rotation data which are then compiled in a mathematical model in order to deduce therefrom the position of the aircraft in space.

In regards to King, King discloses a fastener guide assembly. See Abstract. However, King does not disclose do not disclose a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft which are intended to be push-fitted simultaneously one into the other to fix the inertial unit to the rack where the inertial unit comprising inertial sensors which, in real time, measure acceleration and rotation data which are then compiled in a mathematical model in order to deduce therefrom the position of the aircraft in space.

Applicant respectfully submit that the claimed plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft is not obvious over the teaching of Fischer in view of either Takahashi or King. In addition, one skilled in the art would find nothing in Fischer, Takahashi or King alone or in combination that would disclose, teach or suggest the claimed composition or any reason for making it. This is because there is no motivation taught in any of the references to combine the references in such a way to provide the plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

II. Conclusion

In view of the remarks presented herein, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for final allowance and notice to such effect is requested. If the Examiner believes that additional issues need to be resolved before this application can be passed to issue, the undersigned invites the Examiner to contact her at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 27, 2006

By Sylvia Tan

Sylvia Tan
Reg. No. 47,324
GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166
(212) 801-9200